

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 3, 7, 14, 18, 22-23, 27, 30, and 32-33 are cancelled, and claims 34-39 are added. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-21, 24-26, 28-29, and 31 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-21, 24-26, 28-29, 31 and 34-39 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Applicants express appreciation to Examiner Lipman for the telephone interview held on May 7, 2007 during which the arguments presented in the present Amendment were discussed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-21, 24-26, 28-29, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As pointed out during the telephone interview, support for the claimed another link to a location on a storage medium wherein the data is stored in which a content key encryption key is encrypted by an enabling key block is found, e.g., in Fig. 8B and on page 29, lines 15-18 of the specification which also describes the incentive for providing such a link. It is therefore submitted that the claims are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 12, 21, 25, 26, and 31 have been amended to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. Support for such changes is found, e.g., in Figs. 8B and 10 and on pages 29 and 30-31 of the specification.

The Examiner also indicated that Maruyama, which was cited in the August 3, 2006 Office Action, does not disclose or suggest storing two links to a location on the storage medium. It is therefore submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance.


New claim 34 depends from claim 1, new claim 35 depends from claim 12, new claim 36 depends from claim 21, new claim 37 depends from claim 25, new claim 38 depends from claim 26, and new claim 39 depends from claim 31. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 34-39 is found, e.g., in Fig. 8B and on page 29 of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant